

## MINUTES

### CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DECEMBER 21, 2015

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present:

Chairman Steve Lichtenfeld  
Mark Winings, Aldermanic Representative  
Craig Owens, City Manager  
Ron Reim  
Josh Corson  
Sherry Eisenberg  
Pepe Finn

Absent:

No one

Also Present:

Susan M. Istenes, AICP, Planning Director  
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked that all cell phone ringers be turned off, that conversations take place outside the meeting room and that those who wish to speak approach the podium and to be sure the green light on the microphone is on for property recording of this meeting.

## MINUTES

The minutes of the December 7, 2015 meeting were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – GROUND SIGN (MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE) – 230 SOUTH BRENTWOOD BOULEVARD (BETHESDA BARCLAY HOUSE)

Patrick Smith, sign contractor (Dale Signs), was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance was Scott Middelkamp of Bethesda Barclay House.

Susan Istenes explained that in 2000, the Architectural Review Board approved the installation of a 12-square-foot, double-sided ground sign located in a landscaped area in front of the building.

The sign was installed as approved, and the applicant now proposes to remove the existing sign and erect a new two-sided, 23.3-square-foot ground sign using the existing masonry sign base. The sign will be made of blue aluminum with internally illuminated white lettering. Susan noted that the City's Sign Regulations stated that *Residential buildings with twenty (20) or more units shall be permitted an alternate ground sign not exceeding twelve (12) square feet in area if authorized by the Architectural Review Board*. The proposed sign measures 23.3 square feet, thereby exceeding the allowable 12 square feet by 11.3 square feet, or 93 percent. Therefore, approval of a sign modification is required in order to construct the sign as proposed. The Sign Regulations state that modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. According to the applicant, the new sign will identify the building as an independent senior living community and the sign is consistent with the branding throughout other Bethesda communities. Susan stated that staff is of the opinion that the applicant has not identified any unusual conditions of the building or site that necessitate a larger ground sign than permitted. Staff is of the opinion that the design and location of the proposed sign is acceptable; however, has concerns regarding the size. Although commercial and institutional buildings are permitted a ground sign up to 25 square feet, the Sign Regulations specifically limit multi-family building ground signs to 12 square feet. Staff is not aware of any past sign modification approvals for multi-family ground signs and recommends denial of the request as submitted.

Mr. Smith thanked the Board for allowing them to make this presentation. He then introduced Scott Middelkamp to the members. He indicated that they are requesting a bigger sign for the community of people (elderly) who try to read/see the sign. He noted that the different font style will help, also.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that he agrees with staff that the design is okay, but he is bothered by its large size and that other attempts have been made to get larger signs approved that have been denied.

Mark Winings commented that proposed new sign doesn't look twice as big as the existing sign.

Mr. Smith stated that's probably due to the arched shape top. He stated that the existing sign is difficult to read.

Ron Reim asked if they propose to use the existing base.

Mr. Smith replied "yes".

Ron Reim noted that there is a difference in the sign fabrication.

Mr. Smith concurred, noting that the sign is lighter and will be lit via LED.

Ron Reim asked about the addition of text.

Mr. Smith stated that the words “independent retirement living” were added.

Sherry Eisenberg stated that white lettering makes a big difference.

Mr. Smith agreed, adding that the block style letters make a big difference as well, noting that these features are needed for the building’s location to let people know where it is.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the sign is internally lit.

Mr. Smith replied “yes”.

Mark Winings indicated that he shares his concerns regarding the size of the sign. He stated that the comment that the bigger sign will be easier to read is true for every sign.

Pepe Finn stated that if this sign were on Westwood or similar street she would agree it’s too big, but because it’s on Brentwood Boulevard and across from Enterprise, she’s ok with the proposed size. She added that she appreciates the fact that this sign will serve mostly older people and that this request seems more about people and less about marketing.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that he walked by there over the weekend and the new sign will be over 7-feet tall. He stated that the proposed sign is too large; that LED lit letters can be smaller and be read from further distances.

Pepe Finn commented that 7 feet tall is not even people size.

Chairman Lichtenfeld referred to the 36-inch base plus a 54-inch high sign (7.5-feet), resulting in the top of the sign being close to 8 feet above the sidewalk; too big.

Mr. Smith asked that the members consider the size of the front yard of this building; reiterating that this is a visibility issue.

Sherry Eisenberg asked the height of the existing sign.

Mr. Smith replied “32-inches” (atop the 36-inch base).

Josh Corson asked about the possibility of lowering the base.

Ron Reim questioned if there is other building identification on the structure itself as he would want emergency vehicles to be able to locate the building.

Mr. Smith stated lettering (signage) would have to be very large on the building to be seen; he thinks the address is a little small.

Chairman Lichtenfeld commented that he believes everyone is familiar with the building and that the City appreciates them being in Clayton.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Pepe Finn made a motion to deny the request. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the Board.

Mr. Smith was informed that he could revise the proposal and submit a new application for review by this Board at a future meeting.

PLAN COMMISSION - BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT – 8275 CLAYTON ROAD  
(ANDERSON PARK)

Patty DeForrest, City of Clayton Parks & Recreation Director, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that in 2012, a subdivision plat was approved which consolidated the 12 City-owned properties into one lot for the purposes of creating Anderson Park. In anticipation of an upcoming Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) project in the park which will result in the reconfiguration of the existing street, the Parks Department requests that the City vacate the 0.68-acre Haddington Court right-of-way and that the property lines be adjusted to incorporate the vacated right-of-way into the park. The size of the parcel will increase from 4.6 acres to 5.2 acres. The proposed vacation and boundary adjustment will transfer ownership and maintenance of an unneeded portion of the public right-of-way, and adjust the property boundaries to incorporate the vacated right-of-way into the park. The vacation of City rights-of-way requires approval by the Board of Aldermen. The Public Works Department supports the proposed boundary adjustment and right-of-way vacation and has reviewed the accompanying plat. Susan stated that staff recommends approval of the Boundary Adjustment Plat with the following conditions:

1. That the plat be considered null and void if the Board of Aldermen denies the request for right-of-way vacation.
2. That the applicant provide a Mylar for the appropriate City of Clayton signatures per the Subdivision Ordinance requirements after the Board of Aldermen approves the right-of-way vacation.
3. That the applicant file the plats with the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds office and submit proof of filing to the City within 30 days of Plan Commission approval and after the Board of Aldermen approves the right-of-way vacation.

Ms. DeForrest explained that several years ago, the lots on Haddington Court were consolidated after a flood buy-out, but the street vacation was left out. Because MSD work is scheduled to begin in the park soon, they now request this boundary adjustment. She stated that this boundary adjustment will basically result in the transfer of maintenance from the Public Works Department to the Parks Department.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if there will be a new street.

Ms. DeForrest stated that it will be an entrance to the park and a parking lot.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked how long the project will take.

Ms. DeForrest stated that in total, 3 years; the park work will take about a year.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Josh Corson made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the members.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE (MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE) –  
7817 FORSYTH BOULEVARD (WINE MERCHANT)

Susan Istenes explained that on May 7, 2015, after receiving administrative Architectural Review Board approval by the City Manager, the Planning Department issued a Sign Permit for the installation of a 22.5-square-foot wall sign on the front building façade. The sign was installed and inspected by the City in July. On November 9, 2015, staff observed that vinyl window signs totaling 23.2 square feet had been installed on the two storefront windows of the building without first receiving a sign permit. Based on the size and frontage of the building, permanent window and/or wall signage not to exceed 22.75 square feet is permitted on the front elevation. The existing wall sign and vinyl window signs combined total is 45.7 square feet, which exceeds the 22.75 square feet of allowable building signage and therefore, the window signs require approval by the Architectural Review Board to remain. A 3.36-square-foot vinyl sign was also installed on the front door (considered a sidewalk identification sign) and is permitted in addition to other signs provided it does not exceed 3 square feet. The sign exceeds the allowable size for sidewalk identification signs, and therefore requires approval by the Architectural Review Board to remain. According to the Sign Regulations, modifications should only be granted due to unusual building or site conditions. The applicant has not provided justification for the requested sign modification, and in staff's opinion, there aren't any unusual conditions with the building or site that would warrant an exception to the regulations to allow the vinyl window signs to remain. The total amount of wall and permanent window signs measures 45.7 square feet, which is twice as much as permitted. The window signs cover nearly the all of the storefront windows, create a cluttered appearance due to the amount of text and are not compatible with the building or the existing wall sign. The 3.36-square-foot vinyl sidewalk identification sign on the front door only exceeds the allowable 3 square feet by a small amount and staff is of the opinion that it is acceptable in terms of location, design, and materials. Susan stated that the Sign Regulations allow multiple types of accessory signs that the business has not taken advantage of, including sidewalk signs, 9-square-foot temporary window signs, 6-square foot directional signs, and other temporary banners and attention-getting devices associated with special events and for all the reasons stated, staff does not support the requested sign modification and recommends as follows:

1. To deny the requested sign modification for the 23.2-square-foot vinyl storefront window signs. The signs must be removed by January 4, 2016.
2. To approve the requested sign modification for the 3.36-square-foot vinyl sidewalk identification sign on the front door, with the following condition:
  - a. That the applicant submit an application for a sign permit by January 4, 2016.

No one representing the owner/applicant was in attendance at the meeting.

Ron Reim noted that this Board won't be meeting again before January 4<sup>th</sup>.

Susan Istenes concurred.

Craig Owens stated that he is inclined to go with staff's recommendations and they can come back fresh with a new proposal for either administrative ARB approval or for this Board to review.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that's a good suggestion.

Being no further questions or comments, Craig Owens made a motion to deny the requested sign modification for the 23.2-square foot vinyl storefront windows signs; these signs are to be removed by January 4, 2016, and to approve the requested sign modification for the 3.36-square foot vinyl front door sign with the condition that the applicant submit a sign permit by January 4, 2016. The motion was seconded by Sherry Eisenberg and unanimously approved by the members.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SIGNAGE (MODIFICATION TO SIGN ORDINANCE) – 505-511 SOUTH HANLEY ROAD

Gary Rosenbaum, owner, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that the property contains a 7,586-square-foot, one-story commercial building that was built in 1930 and has the following tenants: Café Manhattan (505 South Hanley Road), Gateway Crossfit (507 South Hanley Road), Body Gears Physical Therapy (proposed-509 South Hanley Road), and Mani Pedi Nail Spa (511 South Hanley Road). The building owner proposes to remove the existing wall signs for the tenants at 505 (Café Manhattan) and 511 South Hanley Road (Mani Pedi Nail Spa), and install 15-square-foot wall signs above the entrance for each of the four building tenants. The signs will be aluminum cabinets painted dark brown with internally illuminated white lettering. The existing vinyl window signs for Café Manhattan (505 South Hanley Road) and Gateway Crossfit (507 South Hanley Road) are to remain. The window signs for Café Manhattan were installed without a Sign Permit. The installation of the proposed

wall signs for Café Manhattan and Gateway Crossfit will cause these two tenants to exceed the allowable amount of signage due to the existing window signs, and therefore require a sign modification. Also proposed for each tenant is a 1 square foot, double sided sign that will hang from the canopy above each tenant's entrance. The signs are constructed of aluminum painted dark brown, with non-illuminated white lettering. These signs are permitted in addition to the allowable window and wall signs and are in conformance with the Sign Regulations. Susan stated that the proposed wall signs and hanging signs are made of high quality materials and will create a unified appearance for the building through the use of signs of the same size, design, and materials. Because the existing vinyl window signs will not be removed, two tenants, Café Manhattan and Gateway Crossfit will exceed the allowable signage per tenant and therefore the applicant is requesting a modification to the Sign Regulations. The Sign Regulations state that modifications should only be granted due to unusual conditions of the building or site. According to the applicant, the vinyl graphic window signs are tasteful, in good condition, and give the tenants their unique brand identity at pedestrian street level, whereas the overhead signs are intended to be consistent and are for vehicular visibility. Susan stated that in staff's opinion, the applicant has not identified any unusual conditions with the building or site that would warrant an exception to the regulations to allow the vinyl window signs to remain. The total amount of proposed wall and permanent window signs exceeds the allowable amount of signage by 59 percent (Café Manhattan) and 50 percent (Gateway Crossfit). The vinyl window signs take away from the cohesive design of the proposed wall and hanging signs. The Sign Regulations allow multiple types of accessory signs that the building tenants may take advantage of, including sidewalk signs, 9-square-foot temporary window signs, 3-square-foot sidewalk identification signs, and other temporary banners and attention-getting devices associated with special events. For these reasons, staff does not support the requested sign modification; however, does approve of the design and materials of the proposed wall and hanging signs. Susan stated that staff's recommendation is:

1. To deny the requested sign modification for Café Manhattan (505 South Hanley Road) and Gateway Crossfit (507 South Hanley Road) which would allow the installation of two 15-square-foot wall signs and allow the existing vinyl window signs to remain.
2. To approve the design and materials of the four proposed 15-square-foot wall signs, and four 1-square-foot hanging signs with the following conditions:
  - a. That the existing vinyl window signs at Café Manhattan (505 South Hanley Road) and Gateway Crossfit (507 South Hanley Road) be removed so that the resulting total square footage of window and wall signs does not exceed the allowable amount per tenant.
  - b. That the applicant submit and receive a sign permit prior to the installation of signage.

Mr. Rosenbaum introduced himself and stated that he remembers back when Velvet Freeze was on that corner. He informed the members that he and a partner bought this iconic property about

3 months ago and that the former owner had not done any upgrades to the property. He stated that he wants to enhance the property and added that they were careful to find a new tenant (Body Gears; physical therapy) who did not need a lot of parking. He stated that up until a year ago, 3 of the 4 tenant spaces were vacant; not everyone knows the property is there. He stated the he, as owner, will be covering the costs associated with the signage and that they have reimbursed their mani-pedi tenant for the sign they already bought/installed. He noted that all the tenants are revenue generating businesses and that as the owner he believes these wall signs will make a difference and will help the tenants stay in business. He added that he believes the building looks better with the proposed signage.

A photo of the building (how it appears today) was distributed. Mr. Rosenbaum stated that planned enhancements to the property include repairing the parking lot in the spring, painting, new HVAC, new or repair the rooftop mechanical screening and these new signs. He asked that the Board approve this request.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that he applauds the owner's desire for consistency; noting that the signs are quite high and that the existing windows signs are the most visible. He stated that the Café Manhattan's boomerang is iconic and asked if the owner considered just the hanging signs perpendicular to traffic.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he agrees that motorists may not see the signs, but people walking down the sidewalk will.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked how he is dealing with the tenants who don't want to remove their existing signs.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he has a good relationship with the tenants; noting that Café Manhattan takes care of the sidewalk. He stated that he doesn't want to see tenants with four different signs, but he's limited to what he can do.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked Mr. Rosenbaum if the window signs will be removed if this Board approves the four 15-square-foot wall signs.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that the Café Manhattan (window) signs are iconic and is reluctant to take them down.

Ron Reim asked if the tenant names can be changed out if the tenants change.

Mr. Rosenbaum replied "yes".

Ron Reim suggested keeping the window signs.

Josh Corson stated he thinks it's better to keep the window signs.



Mr. Rosenbaum commented that the metal signs will be removed. He stated that lighting is needed for the evening. He informed the members that a large mirror will be installed at the corner to help avoid accidents.

Mark Winings stated he likes the new signs and is okay with the existing Café Manhattan signs, but that he wouldn't all the tenants to have window signs.

Mr. Rosenbaum stated that he typically wouldn't allow all that window signage.

Ron Reim stated that the new top signs are a good addition and is okay with the existing Gateway Crossfit and Café Manhattan window signs, but when new tenants or replacement tenants move in, he would not want new window signs.

Being no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve four, 15-square-foot wall signs as proposed and four, 1-square-foot hanging signs as proposed with the following conditions:

- a. That the existing wall signs for Café Manhattan (505 S Hanley Rd) and Mani-Pedi Nail Spa (511 S Hanley Rd) be removed;
- b. That no additional window signs be installed (existing window signs for Café Manhattan and Gateway Crossfit are allowed to remain);
- c. That if the landlord or tenant(s) voluntarily remove(s) existing window signs; they are not allowed to be replaced; and

that the applicant submit and receive a sign permit prior to the installation of new signage. The motion was seconded by Craig Owens and unanimously approved by the Board.

#### ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION - GARDEN SHED – 621 EAST POLO

Lauren Strutman, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Susan Istenes explained that this is a request for the construction of a 352-square-foot accessory structure located in the rear yard which will be used as a garden shed. The height of the proposed structure is +/- 13 feet 6 inches as measured from the existing grade to the midpoint of the pitched roof. The structure is constructed of board and batten cedar siding and has an aged copper patina roof. The primary building materials on the home and detached garage are stucco with slate gray architectural shingles. Wood shingle siding is used on the home's dormers. Board and batten cedar siding is not an approved building material per the Architectural Review Guidelines and the guidelines do not address roofing materials. The accessory structure is located 255 feet from the front property line, 10 feet behind an existing 1.5 story detached garage, and is surrounded by mature trees and vegetation. The applicant has submitted photos taken from the street and adjacent

properties which indicate that the proposed structure is not visible from the street and only slightly visible from neighboring properties due to the location of the existing detached garage, the large setbacks between structures, and the existing mature trees and vegetation. The subdivision trustees have approved the plans and the applicant has submitted approval from the adjacent property owners at 611 and 631 East Polo Drive. The project as proposed is in conformance with the requirements of the R-2 Single Family Dwelling District but not in conformance with Architectural Review Guidelines. Although board and batten cedar siding is not an approved building material, the roof will match the copper patina roof that has been installed on the rear of the home and the structure will not be visible from the street and only slightly visible from any adjacent property. The project has the support of the subdivision trustees and the adjacent property owners, and therefore staff is of the opinion that the structure will have minimal visual impact and recommends approval as submitted.

Ms. Strutman informed the members that the building and the owners were also in attendance. She stated that they are asking permission to build a small structure for use as a garden shed. A site plan was presented. Ms. Strutman showed the members the location of the proposed shed, noting that it is way back on the property and the area densely wooded.

Architectural plans were presented. Ms. Strutman indicated that the cedar, copper patina roof shed will have olive green windows to match the house. She asked for a favorable vote.

Chairman Lichtenfeld asked if the cedar will “gray out”.

Ms. Strutman replied “yes”, noting that the owner wants it to.

Chairman Lichtenfeld stated that the structure looks good.

Being no further questions or comments, Ron Reim made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mark Winings and unanimously approved by the Board.

\*\*\*\*\*

Pepe Finn asked about the City parking lot at Clayton Road and Wydown Boulevard.

Craig Owens informed Pepe that the City sent out a RFP (Request for Proposals) for development of that property.

Being no further question or comments, this meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary